

REMARKS

Claims 1-4 remain pending in the application. Claim 1 has been amended without introduction of new matter. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Claims 1, 2, and 3 again stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 4,419,724 to Branigin et al. ("Branigin") in view of U.S. Patent Number 4,535,404 to Shenk ("Shenk"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Office maintains that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to construct the system of Branigin using the memory-mapped devices of Shenk instead of device IDs, resulting in the invention of claim 1. In particular, the Office Action states that Shenk provides the necessary teaching that a target module has an address range in the memory map including target address data and that a memory-mapped device will also have decoding means for decoding the target address data relating to a target module, as evidenced by Shenk.

Applicant's Remarks, filed on July 11, 2006 (which are hereby incorporated by reference), elaborated on the teachings of both Branigin and Shenk, and pointed out a number of claimed features which were lacking in both of these references. It appears from the Office's present remarks that the Office does not dispute Applicant's understanding of the teaching of both Branigin and Shenk as set out in the previous response. There is therefore no need to elaborate any further here. However, Applicants note the Office's statement (see paragraph 14) that features upon which Applicants rely (i.e., decoding of individual memory and peripheral targets being placed on the processor side of the bus and not in the targets themselves) is not recited in the rejected claim(s). Significantly, the Office does not go on to state that the inclusion of this feature in the rejected claim(s) would not in any case render the claim(s) patentable over Branigin and Shenk.

Accordingly, claim 1 has now been amended specifically to recite this feature. In particular, claim 1 now states that "for a transaction between an initiating module and a target module, decoding of the target address is carried out in the decoding means located in said initiating module." This wording defines, in the same terms as used in the description on pages 23-25, the feature that address decoding of individual memory and peripheral targets is placed on the processor side of the bus and not in the targets themselves. It clearly differentiates the invention from the arrangement described with reference to Figure 3 of Shenk. Moreover, Branigin does not disclose or teach a system in which decoding of target

addresses (individual memory and peripheral targets) is placed on the processor side of the bus and not in the targets themselves. It is therefore respectfully submitted that the incorporation of that feature into claim 1 is sufficient to render the claim patentably distinguishable over the combination of Branigin and Shenk.

Since Shenk was only cited as an exemplar of systems employing memory-mapped device addressing, as acknowledged by the Office in paragraph 12 of the Final Action, reliance must be placed on Branigin for any disclosure or teaching in relation to the feature that decoding of target addresses is placed on the processor side of the bus (i.e., in the initiating module) and not in the targets themselves. In this, Branigin is distinctly lacking.

The Office notes in paragraph 14 of the Final Action that the claim then under consideration specifically stated that each module comprised decoding means. While that is undoubtedly the case, the point at issue here is that, for each and every transaction, *it is the initiating module that performs the decoding of the target address, that is, upstream of the bus architecture*. It is therefore respectfully contended that claim 1, as currently amended, is patentable over the combination of Branigin and Shenk.

Claims 2 and 3 each depend from claim 1, and are therefore patentable over any combination of Branigin and Shenk for at least the reasons set forth above.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 1-3 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

Claim 4 again stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Blum [sic: Branigan and Shenk – see numbered paragraph 7 of the Office Action] in view of U.S. Patent Number 5,761,516 to Rostoker et al. (“Rostoker”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 4 depends from claim 1, and is therefore patentably distinguishable over the Branigan and Shenk patents for at least the same reasons as set forth above. The Rostoker patent fails to make up for the deficiencies of Branigin and Shenk because it, too, fails to disclose or even suggest the combination of features defined by claim 1. Accordingly, claim 4 is patentably distinguishable over the Branigan, Shenk and Rostoker patents regardless of whether these documents are considered individually or in combination. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

The application is believed to be in condition for allowance. Prompt notice of same is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
Potomac Patent Group PLLC

Date: January 28, 2007

By: /Kenneth B. Leffler, Reg. No. 36,075/
Kenneth B. Leffler
Registration No. 36,075

P.O. Box 270
Fredericksburg, Virginia 22404
703-718-8884